



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/539,014	06/16/2005	David Yen-Lung Chung	2003B133D	7413
23455 7590 02/13/2008 EXXONMOBIL CHEMICAL COMPANY 5200 BAYWAY DRIVE P.O. BOX 2149 BAYTOWN, TX 77522-2149				
EXAMINER				
RABAGO, ROBERTO				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1796				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/13/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Attachment to Advisory Action

1. The amendment to the specification filed 1/17/2008 is approved for entry.
2. The amendment to the claims filed 1/17/2008 will not be entered because it would prompt new grounds of rejection. Specifically, the proposed amendments to claims 1, 12 and 71 have limited m to "less than 30," yet claims 6, 17 and 76 explicitly allow m to be as high as 30, and therefore claims 6, 17 and 76 would be rejected as indefinite because they are not within the scope of the parent claims. Furthermore, the proposed amendment to claim 71 has limited alkylstyrene to "not more than 20 wt%," yet claims 81 and 82 allow alkylstyrene content to be as high as 25 wt% or 90 wt%, respectively, and therefore claims 81 and 82 would be rejected as indefinite because they are not within the scope of the parent claims.

The amendment filed 1/17/2008 will furthermore not be entered because applicants' response is not fully responsive to the last Office action. Specifically, no response has been made to the issue set forth in item 3 of the Office action mailed 11/1/2007. In order to be entitled to further consideration, applicants' response must reply to every ground of objection and rejection in the prior Office action. See 37 CFR 1.111. Although claim 71 has been amended, the amendment appears to be directed solely to the prior art rejections, because the amendment is essentially the same as those made in the other independent claims. The response includes no remarks regarding how the amendment overcomes the rejection set forth in item 3. It would

appear that the claim is attempting to indicate that the copolymer includes polymerized units of an alkylstyrene of the type shown in the structure. If this is the case, then the wording of the claims should be amended to clearly reflect this meaning, and the squiggly lines should be either replaced with bond lines (reflecting the manner in which such monomers would necessarily be enchainned into the polymer) or defined in a manner supported by the specification.

3. Applicant's arguments filed 1/17/2008 have been fully considered, and are found to be persuasive regarding the objection to the specification and the rejection under 35 USC 112, as set forth in items 1 and 2 of the Office action mailed 11/1/2007. Although applicants have made numerous errors in the original drafting of their claims and specification, the changes to parameters F and A appear to be those originally intended. Based upon the portions of the specification cited by applicants, both the errors and their correction as reflected in applicants' amendments would be apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art.

4. It appears that applicants' argument in traversal of the prior art rejection over Powers relies on the proposed amendments to all of the independent claims limiting the scope of alkylstyrene content and m. Although the proposed amendments have not been entered, for reasons advanced above, the following is noted. If the same amendments to the independent claims were presented in an enterable amendment, wherein the dependent claims were amended to be consistent with the parent claims,

then the rejection over Powers could be withdrawn, for substantially the reasons advanced by applicants. Particularly, applicants' declaration data supports the premise that a minimum in m would occur as mol% pMS increases; the minimum value for m in polymers of the type made by the methods of Powers would appear to be above the proposed limit of less than 30 for polymers which are also limited to alkylstyrene content of no greater than 20 wt%.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 65 and 66 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Roberto Rábago whose telephone number is (571) 272-1109. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu can be reached on (571) 272-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1796

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Roberto Rábago/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1796

RR
February 8, 2008